TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

IN THE MATTER OF:

MB DOCKET NO. 04-191

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

FOG-OALJ ROD

DATE OF HEARING: JUNE 6, 2005

VOLUME: 3

PLACE OF HEARING: WASHINGTON, D.C.

PAGES: 215-514

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC. COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

BEFORE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C.

IN THE MATTER OF:

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

| MB Docket No. 04-191

For Renewal of License for | Facility ID No. 58830 Station KALW(FM), San Francisco, California

|| File No. BRED-19970801YA

Volume 3

Hearing Room TW A363 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

Monday, June 6, 2005 9:30 a.m.

BEFORE:

Richard L. Sippel, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

NEAL R. GROSS

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the San Francisco Unified School District:

MARISSA G. REPP, ESQ.
of: Hogan & Hartson, LLP
Columbia Square
555 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 637-6845

On Behalf of the Enforcement Bureau:

JAMES W. SHOOK, ESQ. 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20554 (202) 418-1420

DANA E. LEAVITT, ESQ. Special Counsel Division of Investigations 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20554 (202) 418-1317

I-N-D-E-X

<u>WITNESS</u> <u>DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT</u> RECROSS

Jeffrey P. Ramirez 223 226

<u>EXHIBITS</u> <u>DESCRIPTION</u> <u>MARK RECD</u>

<u>SFUSD</u>

76 1997 Renewal Application 222 222

<u>Bureau</u>

58 FCC 303S Instructions 351

June 1995

Start Time: 9:28 a.m. End Time: 5:46 p.m.

Lunch: 11:59 a.m. - 1:31 p.m.

–	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	9:28 a.m.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: We're on the record. This
4	is the first day of testimony in the hearing, San
5	Francisco Unified School District for Renewal License,
6	Station KALW-FM, San Francisco, California.
7	This morning I will take attendance on the
8	appearances on the record, and then as we going along
9	during the week that won't be necessary anymore.
10	But let me again start with San Francisco,
11	Ms. Repp.
12	MS. REPP: Your Honor, for San Francisco
13	Unified School District, Marissa G. Repp and Martin
14	Price. Also in attendance is Angela Miller, Deputy
15	General Counsel of San Francisco Unified School
16	District.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Good morning, Ms. Miller.
18	Good morning everyone, and on behalf of
19	the Bureau?
20	MR. SHOOK: James Shook and Dana Leavitt.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I think the does
22	anybody have any preliminary matters that they want to

1	raise?
2	MS. REPP: Yes, Your Honor, there is an
3	exhibit that I would like to enter into the record as
4	SFUSD Exhibit No. 76. I believe that's where we
5	needed to start up from. It is an amendment to the
6	pending 1997 Renewal Application that was submitted to
7	the secretary's office on June 2nd, 2005.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Which application; the
9	pending?
10	MS. REPP: This is an amendment.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
12	MS. REPP: Bringing up to date the Renewal
13	Application that was submitted by the District in
14	1997.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Let me see that. I
16	want to be sure that I'm in synch with that number.
17	Let's see, the last your last exhibit number and
18	as I indicated well, let me see. Let me look at my
19	order. Maybe that's the fastest way to find it.
20	Exhibit 75, I was reserving Exhibit 75 for
21	the proof of the publications. You're absolutely
22	right, 74 would be the public statement exhibits. So

1 76 is it. Is there any objection? 2 MR. SHOOK: No objection. 3 JUDGE SIPPEL: All right, we'll have it. 4 MS. REPP: Your Honor, if I could just 5 point out for the record that among other things that 6 this amendment does is it updates section three of the 7 form 303-S, question 1-B to reflect that the response 8 is no. Commission records do not indicate the 9 supplemental ownership reports for the licensee were 10 filed within 30 days of each change in membership for the Board of Education. 11 12 When such filing supplemental requirement 13 was in effect, newer ones by annual filings were 14 required under rule revisions that became effective on 1.5 February 19, 1999 where bi-annual ownership reports 16 filed on a timely basis until 2001. In other words, 17 this amendment is updating the response on the filing 18 of the ownership reports to the SEC to reflect that 19 that's a no with an explanation. 20 In section three, question two of the form 21 303-S is likewise amended to provide that the response 2.2 is no, it's a rather long explanation. Your Honor,

+	would you like me to read it into the record?
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: I don't think there's any -
3	- if you think it would be helpful to summarize it.
4	MS. REPP: Yes, I can summarize it as to
5	saying that prior to 2001 the requisite ownership
6	reports were not timely filed in the public inspection
7	file, and issues programs lists have not always been
8	timely filed within ten days at the end of the
9	calendar quarter, nor has the issues programs list
10	always included the specified information as well as
11	by the issues programs list for the year 1991 have not
12	been filed.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
14	MS. REPP: May I approach the bench and
15	provide you a copy?
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Please.
17	MS. REPP: Exhibit 76.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Please do, be sure that the
19	Bureau has their copies and that the reporter,
20	probably our most important participant in this.
21	MS. REPP: Yes, I gave it to her.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. For record

1	purposes you can do this now, Ms. Reporter, or when we
2	have a recess, but this document will be marked and
3	received in evidence as SFUSD No. 76; there being no
4	objection.
5	(Whereupon, the document
6	referred to was marked for
7	identification and received
8	into evidence as SFUSD Exhibit
9	No. 76.)
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. Thank you. Ms.
11	Repp, do you have anything more?
12	MS. REPP: That's it, Your Honor.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Anything on behalf of the
14	Bureau?
15	MR. SHOOK: No, Your Honor.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I guess the quicker
17	we start the testimony, the quicker we leave.
18	MS. REPP: Well, the District would like
19	to call to the stand Jeffrey P. Ramirez to be
20	available for cross examination.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Will you take the stand,
22	Mr. Ramirez? Thank you. Raise your right hand before

2	Whereupon:
3	JEFFREY P. RAMIREZ
4	was called for examination by Counsel for the SFUSD,
5	having been first duly sworn, assumed the witness
6	stand, was examined and testified as follows:
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Please be seated.
8	MS. REPP: Your Honor, we have prepared a
9	book that's been reviewed by the Bureau that's a
10	summary of some of the testimony and exhibits for the
11	convenience of Mr. Ramirez during his cross.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's fine.
13	MR. PRICE: Your Honor, we also have a
14	copy for you if that's going to make it easier for
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, it may. Thank you
16	very much. Appreciate that.
17	MS. REPP: Your Honor, we're just turning
18	to the first item here, which is SFUSD Exhibit T-1.
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION
20	BY MS. REPP
21	Q Mr. Ramirez, this is entitled "Direct
22	Testimony of Jeffrey P. Ramirez." It is signed by you

you sit down.

1	under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true
2	and correct on May 2nd, 2005. Mr. Ramirez, is this a
3	true and accurate copy of your testimony as executed
4	by you on May 2nd, 2005?
5	A Yes, it is, however, I'd like to make two
6	changes to it.
7	Q What are those changes?
8	A The two changes are on the second to last
9	and the last page or yes, pages 20 or 19 and 20 for
10	the sentence starting on line 26, that starts with
11	"CPB was eager to hire me." It gives the impression
12	that I notified them that I was considering leaving
13	KALW.
14	That in fact should say that I had already left
15	KALW, and then the next sentence should follow in the
16	tense that they knew why I had left the station.
17	Q With those revisions, is this a
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: No.
19	MS. REPP: I'm sorry, Your Honor.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, I know, I was going to
21	say, I don't think it's necessary to make any physical
22	changes to the exhibit. Do you have any problems with

1	that?
2	MR. SHOOK: The record will reflect
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
4	MR. SHOOK: the changes.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: My point exactly. Thank
6	you.
7	BY MS. REPP
8	Q Mr. Ramirez, with those changes, does this
9	test direct testimony that's Exhibit T-1 reflect
LO	your current and accurate statement?
L1	A Yes, it does.
12	Q And this statement is made, and you
L3	understand that it's made under penalty of perjury?
L4	A Yes, I understand.
L5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Before you begin, would you
L6	just make a brief proper for the record as to what is
17	the purpose and the relevance of this testimony from
18	this witness?
L9	MS. REPP: The purpose and relevancy of
20	Mr. Ramirez' testimony is to establish the facts and
21	understandings of the time relating to the preparation
22	and submission to the Commission of the Renewal

1	Application that was filed on August 1, 1997 on behalf
2	of the San Francisco Unified School District to renew
3	the license of non-commercial Station KALW, San
4	Francisco, California.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you very much. Your
6	witness.
7	CROSS EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. SHOOK
9	Q Mr. Ramirez, could you please describe the
10	Next Generation Project?
11	A The Next Generation Project was a CPB
12	sponsored strategic management training program that
13	I was a part of from, I believe, early 1995 through
14	1997.
15	Q Did the Next Generation Project involve a
16	Public Radio Station management training?
17	A I don't remember if it included training
18	specific to managing a Public Radio station.
19	Q What kind of managerial training, if any,
20	did the project involve?
21	A For the most part, it was related to
22	strategic planning, such as planning programming

1 changes at a station. Part of the program involved a 2 stipend that allowed participants to go to 3 conferences. Travel to other stations and see how 4 they operate their stations. 5 I used part of my stipend to travel to the 6 Public Radio Conference here in Washington, D.C. in 7 1996. I also used part of my stipend to visit 8 Minnesota Public Radio, and basically get a tour of 9 their operation and spend a couple of days observing 10 how they produce their programs. Going to a Garrison Keillor recording, 11 12 that's produced, seeing how and meeting 13 managers. There were about a dozen of us in the 14 program, and so there is -- feel like a veteran. We 15 were able to network with each other and create a 16 support group I suppose. 17 Because in the subsequent years after the program, it was nice to be able to call any of the 18 19 folks who I was in the program with and talk about our 20 experiences at our stations. 21 0 In of the people who terms were

participants in the program, was Nicole Sawaya one of

22

1	them?
2	A Yes, she was.
3	Q So she was one of the dozen that was in
4	your group?
5	A Yes.
6	Q How often would the group get together, if
7	at all?
8	A We got together once here in Washington to
9	kickoff the program. We would meet at the regularly
LO	scheduled conference just to save cost of course,
L1	since quite a number of the people who were in the
12	program would also be attending, say, the Public Radio
L3	Conference here in Washington or wherever it was held
14	in the subsequent year, so two or three times a year.
15	Q And the program extended for about how
L6	long?
L7	A The program was supposed to be a year
18	long, if I remember correctly, but then the project
19	officer at CPB left CPB, and so the project there
20	was no one left there to coordinate the project for a
21	period of time.
22	Then a new project officer was hired, and

22

1	in fact, the year that I was in the program overlapped
2	with the next generation of the Next Generation class.
3	So, in fact, we all 20 of us graduated at the same
4	time from the program.
5	Q But Nicole Sawaya was part of your
6	original group?
7	A Yes.
8	Q And she graduated with you?
9	A Yes.
LO	Q Did your training involve primarily
L1	coursework or was there something else that was
L2	involved?
L3	A Yes, there was coursework, say for
14	instance, that the kickoff meeting that we had here in
15	Washington was a Strategic Management Workshop, I
16	think it was like a two or three day event, where a
17	consultant came in and trained us as to strategic
18	management. So there wasn't any take home work,
19	anything like that. Then again we'd meet at the
20	conferences and there would be another workshop. I
21	can't recall the specifics of the workshops that we
22	attended at the conferences, but they were there, they

22

1	were training workshops.
2	Q The amount of time that you actually had
3	to spend in the Next Generation Project itself, from
4	the time you started to the time you finished was
5	roughly how long?
6	A I'm not sure if I understand your
7	question. Do you mean the time that we spent together
8	as a group?
9	Q Well, in terms of the Next Generation
10	Project, whatever it was that you had to do in order
11	to graduate, be it reading materials, be it meeting
12	people, be it going to places. How long were you
13	actually in a training setting?
14	A Well, certainly when we met together, we
15	were spending time on the project. I also remember
16	that we would have to send in reports to our project
17	officer maybe once or twice a year to let them know or
18	to let the CPB know how the Next Generation Project
19	activities were influencing our work at our stations.
20	I can remember one of the reports that I
21	wrote talked about activities that I actually
22	conducted back at my radio station at KPBS at the

1 time, where I took some of the training. 2 They were consulting workshops, I remember 3 this. One of the training sessions we had as part of 4 the Next Generation Project was to learn how to 5 consult with a small group of your colleagues. 6 So the exercise was get together with two 7 other people in the project, come up with a problem that you might have at your station, and consult with 8 9 the group to find out -- to get their advice, to then 10 go and take care of the problem. 11 I remember at KPBS, I managed a group of 12 four or five folks, and it was a daily program that we 13 produced, so day to day. Actually, when we were 14 producing the program, minute by minute, there was some issue that would come up and we would have to 15 16 consult with each other. 17 So one of my reports talked about how, when I got back to the station, I replicated the 18 19 consulting training that I learned through the project 20 back at the station. 2.1 0 How many -- you mentioned reports, how 22 many reports did you have to prepare to submit to CPB?

1	A Again, my general recollection is one or
2	two reports a year. I don't remember if they were
3	scheduled on specific dates or if they were reports
4	that we have to write following some major activity
5	that we may have been involved in, like meeting at a
6	conference or meeting for a training workshop, that
7	type of activity.
8	Q Now in terms of your workshops, those were
9	sort of the classrooms if you will, that this project
10	was all about?
11	A Essentially, yes, there was the workshop
12	components. There was the meeting with folks as a
13	group to talk about the problems we were having at our
14	stations that support group function. Then there was
15	the ability to call individuals as needed to talk
16	about problems we were having.
17	The other part about the program was the
18	mentoring aspect. So the project teamed up the
19	younger people in the project with more veteran
20	established people in the industry.
21	In fact, one of my mentors was the Senior
22	Vice President for Operations at Minnesota Public

1	Radio, so that also gave me the opportunity to call an
2	older person, someone with more experience to get
3	advice, talk about problems I was having back at my
4	station.
5	Q In terms of the workshops, approximately
6	how many days of workshops were there from the start
7	of the project to the finish?
8	A Considering the number of conferences that
9	probably took place, considering the initial meeting
10	we had here in Washington to kickoff the project that
11	included a training workshop, I'd say no more than
12	ten.
13	Q At these ten, generally all 12
14	participants in the Next Generation Project would
15	attend?
16	A I don't remember everyone being able to
17	participate in every workshop because schedules being
18	what they are, some people were absent, but most of
19	the people I remember were able to attend the
20	workshops.
21	Q And in that sense, your contact with
22	Nicole Sawaya during this period would have been

1	limited primarily to these workshops?
2	A Yes, at the time I was still working at
3	KPBS, and I think she was still the station manager at
4	KZYX in Northern California.
5	Q During these workshops did regulatory
6	issues ever come up in terms of required filings at
7	the FCC?
8	A I don't remember that ever coming up.
9	Q Could you describe for us how you prepared
10	for your appearance today?
11	A I prepared by you mean in terms of
12	meeting with the SFUSD attorneys?
13	Q Well, just in terms of you're sitting here
14	now trying to recount events that took place seven,
15	eight years ago, a rather difficult process for any of
16	us. So I'm just trying to get an idea of how it was
17	you got ready in order to be able to testify about
18	events that took place so long ago?
19	A That's a pretty large question.
20	MR. PRICE: Your Honor, if I may just
21	interject a moment. I just want to caution the
22	witness that, not to disclose conversations he may

1 have had with counsel, but otherwise, you're free to 2 answer the question. 3 THE WITNESS: Okay. 4 JUDGE SIPPEL: You understand that? THE WITNESS: 5 Yes. I mean, I generally 6 try to remember as best as possible -- yes, what I 7 remember thinking, what I remember doing, 8 remember working with from nearly ten years ago. It's 9 been quite an exercise, because now that I'm working 10 on my second or third job, depending on how you count, I'm that much more removed from those days back in San 11 12 Francisco. I've been trying to remember what was 13 going on back in those days. 14 BY MR. SHOOK: 15 Q Did you review any documents? Yes, I have reviewed documents. 16 Α 17 Could you tell us what they were? Well, they would be all the documents 18 Α included in this book. They would include, which I'm 19 20 assuming includes -- I even copied this book actually 21 -- which includes -- which would include the actual 22 Application additional License Renewal and the

1	documents that were attached to that. The regulatory
2	materials that I would have read back in 1997, those
3	types of documents.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, in fairness to the
5	witness I mean, you say that you've reviewed all
6	the documents that are in this book, and that book is
7	not in evidence. The T-1, your exhibit, T-1 is in
8	evidence, but the rest of the documents, unless
9	they're in evidence in some other form.
10	THE WITNESS: Actually, I'm assuming I've
11	seen everything in this book.
12	MR. PRICE: These are the documents that
13	are the exhibits that were either introduced at the
14	admission session several weeks ago that correspond to
15	Mr. Ramirez' testimony.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, these are marked and
17	they're in the record.
18	MR. PRICE: That's correct, Your Honor.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: The way they're appearing
20	here, they're not marked, they're just attached to T-
21	1. The way it's being used here, that's all I'm
22	trying to get clear.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	MR. PRICE: That's correct, Your Honor.
2	MR. SHOOK: That document is tabulated,
3	isn't it?
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, it is tabulated.
5	MR. SHOOK: Well then, Mr. Ramirez, why
6	don't you just go through and with each tab give us a
7	general description of
8	THE WITNESS: Sure.
9	MR. SHOOK: what the document is.
LO	THE WITNESS: There's no tab for the first
.1	document, but this is my direct written testimony.
L2	MR. PRICE: There should be an indication,
L3	Mr. Ramirez, in the upper right hand corner of an
L4	exhibit number or identification.
L5	THE WITNESS: Okay. So it appears the tab
L6	number is located after the section. So tab one is my
L7	direct testimony. Tab two is my
L8	MR. PRICE: I apologize. That was T-1 was
L9	your testimony. I believe the first exhibit which
20	would be one, would be Exhibit No. 1, which would be
21	your deposition transcript.
22	MR. SHOOK: We're doing our best to

1	confuse everybody.
2	THE WITNESS: Okay. So there is no
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: There is no tab for the
4	first document.
5	THE WITNESS: There's no tab in there,
6	okay, here's what
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: But it is marked as an
8	exhibit, SFUSD Exhibit T-1.
9	THE WITNESS: Okay.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now starting with the tab,
11	the tabbed items are not marked as exhibits, but on
12	the representative counsel they are actually in the
13	record. At an admission session last week we put them
14	in the record, they have an exhibit number someplace.
15	THE WITNESS: Okay.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: If you would just identify
17	starting with tab one, tab one is your deposition.
18	THE WITNESS: Tab one is my November of
19	2004 deposition.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Tab two is?
21	THE WITNESS: Tab two appears to be a CPB
22	Annual Financial Report for KALW dated June 30th,